24 Jul 97

Minutes from the AMC Integrated Process and Product Management (IPPM)
Working Group Meeting
24 – 26 June 1997 at the Defense Acquisition Deskbook Office
Wright Patterson Air Force Base, Dayton, OH

1. **Opening Remarks:** The meeting was opened by Gil Langford, AMCRDA, with a welcome to all attendees. Joe Smith, Acquisition Deskbook Program Office, added some administrative announcements. A list of attendees is found at Enclosure 1.

2. **Update of AMC Pamphlet 70-27:**

a. Ed Landry, NSM, provided a brief overview of the process he used to rewrite and restructure the pamphlet. The key concern was that each topic be self-contained so it could be used as "stand-alone" guidance in the Deskbook.

b. The Working Group then reviewed the draft update from a content perspective. The following comments were provided:

(1) It was reemphasized that the intent of the IPPM philosophy is to have one fully integrated IPT rather than separate Government and contractor IPTs. The goal is an Army membership on the IPT that is equal and completely involved in the development process. The intent is to provide real time input to the process and to alleviate the need for reviews designed solely to impart information to the staff. The 155mm Lightweight Howitzer Program Team was referenced as an example of a fully integrated team. Jamie offered to provide examples of small program IPT organizational structures for inclusion in the pamphlet.

(2) Many of the smaller programs do not require numerous tiers of sub-teams as are often employed on larger systems. When this sort of layering is necessary, cross talk between and among the various sub-teams must be possible.

(3) Several concerns and issues were discussed relative to the personnel issues associated with teaming. Team awards and team appraisals were noted as things that are external to the team but that help facilitate the teaming process. Teaming skills and the problems associated with interaction of various personality types (Meyers-Briggs, etc.) were areas of concern. The pamphlet currently addresses some of these personnel issues but additional guidance may be appropriate.

(4) Team member empowerment was raised as an area of concern. The pamphlet addresses empowerment in Vol. 1. It was suggested that functional area managers be rated on their support for IPT, both as to technical expertise and empowerment.

(5) The issue of leadership styles versus leadership selection was discussed. It was concluded that the issue of style was inappropriate, except as it is implicit in the selection criteria, and that the topic should be dropped from the pamphlet.

(6) Discussions were held relative to Integrated Concept Teams (ICTs) and Integrated Product Teams (IPTs). As the process currently operates, ICTs are executed soon after a requirement is defined. As the concept becomes fully developed and a program is established, IPTs are formed and begin to function. Initially, there may be some overlap and one or two members of the ICT may transition to the IPT. Earlier changes to the pamphlet have essentially clarified the roles of ICT versus IPT. The preface was overlooked in this process. It will be revised in the event hardcopy publication of the guidebook continues after insertion into the Defense Acquisition Deskbook (DAD).

(7) IPPM relative to smaller systems was discussed; Jamie Ruffing, TACOM-ARDEC, and Bruce Buckland, SSCOM, provided draft narrative on this topic for inclusion in the rewrite of DA Pamphlet 70-3. Further material, including examples, will be included in the pamphlet.

3. **OSD Acquisition Deskbook Overview:** LTC London, Deskbook Program Manager, presented a demonstration of the Defense Acquisition Deskbook (DAD). He noted that the Deskbook is organized for ease of use from the perspective of the user/researcher, not the author of topical information. Information is contained in the Deskbook in only one location but there are multiple paths to that information. The system also has the capability for "wild card" searches. Information content is therefore the issue for topical authors.

The DAD contains a glossary that is fairly short. It was prepared by the Defense Acquisition Program Working Group and its content is controlled by them. It only lists terms that are not adequately defined elsewhere. Acronyms contained in text submitted for the DAD are entered exactly as received. It is therefore probable that discrepancies exist.

The DAD is being distributed more frequently in CD format because Local Area Networks (LANs) are not as responsive as desired. It was noted that the Deskbook program can acquire, process, and mail a CD for about $2.00. It was also noted that the DAD CD is updated quarterly and it is therefore possible to add sections of information into the DAD incrementally rather than all at once. It was suggested that it is better to error initially on the side of inclusion. As the DAD comes into focus after pamphlet entries have been added, we may conclude that certain topics are better maintained by other organizations. It was also noted that the same topic should be mapped into many different areas of the DAD to see where it fits the best.

4. **TACOM-ARDEC IPPM Training:** Jamie Ruffing, TACOM-ARDEC, presented a review of IPT training at ARDEC. Their program has evolved from a 3-day course to a 1-day course. Training is conducted in-house on a just-in-time basis. It includes an off-site session devoted to team building. They have concluded that training must be timed to meet the needs of the teams, that refresher training is necessary, that leadership skills training is required, and that multiple phases are appropriate.

5. **MICOM IPPM Training:** Gary Maddux , University of Alabama-Huntsville (UAH), presented an overview of MICOM's IPPM training course. This course has already been briefed at Soldier System Command and is routinely taught in the MICOM community and at UAH. Mr. Phil Farrington, UAH, transformed the IPPD seminar into a graduate level college course.

It was noted that it is wise to give an accurate assessment of success stories and not to oversell the process. The course consists of typical team building exercises, empowerment and responsibility issues, typical team composition, a section on RFP requirements and source selection, performance versus detailed specs, and partnership guidance from AMC. McDonald, Lockheed-Martin, Texas Instruments, Navy, and Air Force sources were consulted during the development of this course. To date, the course has been taught 25 times either directly to a PM office as a program is being initiated or later when initial execution is difficult, or at general sessions offered periodically at MICOM.

The focus of the MICOM program is on joint Government and contractor teams, typical conflict scenarios, and team building exercises. The course is oriented around 1-hour lectures followed by group exercises and report out of the exercise results. Decision making tools are introduced early in the class and incorporated into the majority of group exercises.

The general offerings are open to anyone, including contractors. IPPD is essentially a philosophy so the objective is to understand each other's perspectives and to dispel the myths. General sessions are offered approximately 4 times per year.

UAH incorporates the college level version of the IPPD course in their Engineering Management Graduate Program. Motivational theory and many other topics are easily related to the IPPD course. UAH is

currently developing training programs for performance specifications and cost as an independent variable. Widespread availability of the Internet is making these tasks much easier.

The University of Alabama is currently looking at all the acquisition reform initiatives, current as well as previous initiatives, to qualify the relationships and the evolutionary path that has brought the process of development and acquisition reform to its current juncture.

In response to a question from the floor, Gary indicated they do not have a separate training program to refresh team members. From time to time they do train teams that have attempted to proceed without training and then decided to invest in a formal training program.

Gary noted that one of the best general sessions he has observed was a class that was comprised of PMs, Deputy PMs, and contractor upper management.

In response to a question, Gary noted that UAH would respond to consulting service requests initiated by class attendees, but that they do not market their services or capabilities as part of the IPPD training. Gary's department has three continuing contracts with MICOM; work is done on a task order basis. (Classes are provided through the Continuing Education Department.) They provide consulting advice for local area network design, Internet applications to support non co-located integrated product teams (calendars, action item databases, technical document preparation and editing), and replacement of obsolete electronic components. Gary will provide a set of course books, a sample agenda, and answer any future questions.

6. **TACOM IPPM Training:** Al Hardy, TACOM, provided an overview of their IPPM training program. They have adopted the Texas Instrument (TI) IPPD methodology. Teams are trained in the mechanics of teaming prior to being trained in the TI's program. The TI program was developed specifically for government use. It results in a checklist that is tailored to a specific program. The checklist is a very detailed description of everything that must be done to complete a task. A bullet report is used to close out a task. A self-help aid booklet is also part of the program. It is important to have the support of program leadership and the discipline to use the methodology and be guided by the direction of the checklist.

Texas Instruments performs the initial training and certification of trainers. The program is then taught by TACOM personnel. As program teams are formed, training specific to that team is conducted.
The TI IPPD process methodology is controlled by TI and must be licensed from them. Al noted that UDLP licensed the program after they worked with it and TACOM on the Composite Armored Vehicle program. It was noted that TACOM has not attempted to migrate the TI IPPD process methodology to the ACALA or ARDEC.

7. **DOD IPPM Training:** A discussion of IPPD courses available at the DOD level revealed the following:

- Mike Zak at OSD is a proponent of IPPD courses at the DOD level.
- Defense Acquisition University (DAU) and Defense Systems Management College (DSMC) were tasked to develop an IPPD course(s). A contractor (Human Technologies Incorporated) has been hired to develop the course content and a video. The course envisioned to be a week long with 2 days of classroom training and 3 days of internet based work. The first offering is expected in Feb 98.
- It was noted that at one time there was a plan to transfer the UAH IPPD course to DSMC but DSMC representatives felt UAH was better qualified and should retain the course. OSD representatives were referred to Gary Maddux but have yet to contact him.
- The National Center for Advanced Technologies, Georgia Institute of Technology, and Texas Instruments developed a 12-video module based program and associated materials, and a workbook for IPPD training. Bruce Buckland provided a brochure describing this program as well as a case study videotape.

8. **IPPM Successful Management Practices Study:** Tom Schneider presented an overview of the recently completed IPPM Successful Management Practices study conducted on behalf of the Working Group. This study was patterned after the Navy Best Manufacturing Practices program. The following study observations were highlighted:

- Feedback from the study indicates the need to put the IPPM Pamphlet in the DAD as an integrated document.
- Chartering and total team training is essential.
- Some lower level IPTs were process oriented.
- Contractors often had their own internal teams even if there were joint government/contractor IPTs.
- The problems associated with electronic communication are significant. It is difficult to achieve problem-free exchange of data across different hardware platforms and software programs. The various transformations required are not always obvious or easy to achieve.

Additional copies of the study report and the briefing charts are available, and members of the study team will present the briefing upon request. Discussions following Tom's presentation concluded that the next logical step is to survey ACAT III and IV programs.

9. **IPPM Metrics:** Peg Mion, TECOM, presented the results of a metrics study she performed for the Working Group. The initial objective of the metrics study was to be able to measure improvements to the acquisition process that were due solely to the use of the IPPD philosophy. To date, it has been impossible to find a succinct answer to this question. The result of this study is therefore a list of suggested performance indicators that teams may use in a subjective self-evaluation of their activity. A general discussion following Peg's presentation concluded that the performance indicators she developed should be incorporated into Vol 2 of the guidebook.

10. **DA Pamphlet 70-3 Update:** A discussion of draft input to DA Pamphlet 70-3 was held. Draft narrative provided by Bruce Buckland and Jamie Ruffing formed the basis of the discussion. Bob Whiteley, AMCRDA, volunteered to compose a final draft reflecting the observations and conclusions reached. It was noted that there will be several iterations prior to the finalization of DA Pamphlet 70-3.

11. **Next Meeting:** The next meeting of the AMC IPPM Working Group has been scheduled for 3-5 Feb 98 at STRICOM. The following ideas were discussed relative to future Working Group activity:

- Conduct a study of IPPM Successful Practices for small (ACAT III and IV) systems.
- Conduct a series of on-site assessments with selected contractors.
- Restructure Vol 3 of AMC P 70-27 to concentrate on the "art of teaming." Jamie Ruffing volunteered to draft a topical outline for this prior to the next meeting.
- Develop IPPM guidance for the science and technology, pre MS I, phase of the development and acquisition process.
- Develop a checklist for the production phase.
- Develop a means to stress production readiness and producibility in the early phases of a program.
- Solicit PM and PEO representation on the Working Group
- Revisit the issue of a Charter for the WG

Tom Schneider
AMC IPPM Working Group
Secretariat

Enclosure 1

Attendee List for AMC Integrated Process and Product Management (IPPM)
Working Group Meeting
24 – 26 June 1997 at the Defense Acquisition Deskbook Office
Wright Patterson Air Force Base, Dayton, OH

Attendee	**Organization**
Gil Langford	HQ AMC (AMCRDA)
Bob Whiteley	HQ AMC (AMCRDA)
Carlton Harris	HQ TRADOC
Peg Mion	TECOM
Al Hardy	TACOM
Jamie Ruffing	TACOM-ARDEC
Bruce Buckland	SSCOM
Tom Schneider	IEA
Alan Peltz	IEA
Edward Landry	NSM
Gary Maddux	Univ of Alabama – Huntsville
Joe Smith	Acquisition Deskbook PMO
LTC London	Acquisition Deskbook PMO